G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1911-12

(Miscl)

File No. 113-11

Serial Nos. 1 to 5

Papers Filed.

Month February 1912

SUBJECT.

Appeal petition re the Archakaship of the temples of Sri Mahadeveswara & Mahalingeswara at Rajabommanahally Malavalli Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES
B Ramachandra Rao Recorder	

G.R.S. 11] 190/ .

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Mysore)

NOTES.

File No. I.C 11

FILE HEADING.

Appeal petition of Servegar Ranjappa, against the order of the Dy Comr, Mysore &c, re the pujaristhip &c of temples of Mahadeveswara & Mahalingeswara at Ragibommanahally, in the Malavalli Tk

From

Servegar Ranjappa of Ragibommanahally, Malavalli Tk

No. petn Dated 24/8/11 Received 24/8/11.

Diary No. 297 Enclos. nil Spare Copies nil Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the order of the Dy Comr, Mysore &c refusing to recognise his right to manage the affairs of the said temples and prays that the pujaris appointed by him may not be disturbed till this appeal is disposed of

NOTES AND ORDERS.

for

This is an appeal against the order of the Dy Comr, Mysore &c refusing to recognise his right of the appellant to manage the affairs of the temples the appellant seems to have appointed one Varadachar Pujari. The Dy Comr has decided in favour of one Channiah etc &

NOTES—First sheet.

GPB—15,000—24-4 09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 19 11

7:7

Serial No.

Said he was once been fined for drunkenness and to be a leper. The Dr has said that a fine to his shame be appointed.

His prayer that the two appeal is defend of Varish may not be disturbed.

This appears to be a fit case in which costs may be charged.

Submitted for orders

Asst to the Mysore

28/9/11.

Dy Commr

Mysore

Submitted with 2 Dfts

M
28/9/11 Dy Comm Mysore

2 To the Dy Comm. Mysore &c—
No 542 Dt 1.9.1911
Forward the petn for report—

3 To Serane gowda Varj—
Endrsd No 543 Dt 9 1911.
(thro his advo. Mr. D. Venkataramayya)

4 From, the Dy Comm, Mysore Dist
Letter no 115 Dt 21.9.1911
Submits report called for in 8 2.
Submitted with Dft notices for the 1st nov

M
28/9/11

Note—Contn sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8-10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 1911

Serial No.

3. y.

The facts of the case, as gathered from the Vernacular records, are given below: —

On 2d and 6th Nov. 1908, Jannadi channiah complained to the Mysore Dy Comr and the Malavalli Dy office that on the death of his father Chandiah who was Jannade of Madeneswara and Mahalingeswara Devasthan Ragi Bommanahalli, he had been worshipping the deities, that he had gone to Vanjangud for some days having asked his Br-in-law Permit to worship for him and that after his return, the Patel with the aid of some of the villagers tried to deprive him of the post and threatened him with death if he entered into the Temple - the petition to the Dy. Comr was forwarded to the Amildar - On 7th Nov, Patel madappa reported to the Taluk office that channiah's conduct was bad and he was not doing Puja properly and that the villagers had appointed Veeriah in his stead and prayed that the crops on the Inam land might be held in amanath and the new Pujari permitted to reside in the house intended for the Pujaries.

The Amildar examined the parties - Patel madappa repeated what he already said.

NOTE— Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000— 12 8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 1911

Serial No.

W The Sahibs while supporting the Patel, added that the old Pujari Channiah and his father, and Veeriah were not hereditary Archaks. The residents of Nagamer village (whose enquiry the Patel urged) and Patel Nadarajiah of Settihalli complained that Channiah, while a temporary Pujari of the temples in their respective villages, did not in spite of warning, perform Puja regularly and that his character was bad. Jammadi Channiah while repeating what he said, added that his Br in-Law Veeriah was doing Puja and prayed that the post might be given to him.

V On 8th Decr 1908, the Amildar reported that on a visit to the village, he came to know that there was truth in the general complaints against Channiah and added that as Channiah was not hereditary Pujari, and was not doing his work properly, the villagers (it seemed to him) were right in appointing a new Pujari.

U On a perusal of the petition of 14th Decr 1908 presented on behalf of Channiah,

V the Dy. Commr directed on 21st Decr 1908 that the Patel should be warned not to remove Pujaries on his own authority,

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8-10

G. R S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 1911

Serial No.

and ordered a detailed enquiry and reports as to the hereditary claims and the bad character of channiah and approved of the arrangements made to take work temporarily from Veeriah and added that the crops should be sold and the proceeds held in deposit.

The Amildar issued notices to the parties and their witnesses and the case was adjd more than once. Channiah complained to the Dy Commr that the Amildar who was unnecessarily adjourning the case, told him that his case would go against him and that there was no use in spending money thro. fees to Lawyers. The Amildar reported that these charges were groundless and that the Lawyer engaged was a troublesome man the Dy Commr in reply directed the Amildar to complete the enquiry- On 11th March 1910, the Amildar reported that channiah failed to appear before him though served with notices and Sarvegar Nanjappa and several others in their Kajjiyat by 13th Feby. 1910 corroborated the several complaints against channiah-

On 30th March 1910 channiah having Complaining

NOTE— Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000— 12 8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 115 of 19 11

Serial No.

that the Amildar was prejudiced against him, the Dy. Commr referred the case to Mr. Ramanathan, Proby. Asst. Commr, who has examined the parties. their depositions are filed with the records.

9 On 4th June 1910, the Patel has deposed that Channiah was doing Puja for 3 years; and before him, his father was doing Puja for 15 years; and before the latter, Veerabhadriah, for 2 years, and before Veerabhadriah, one Madiah, for 20 or 25 years; and before him, one Subbiah for 60 years; and that Veerabhadriah's son Veeriah who has been doing Puja, has married Channiah's own sister

It is also said that channiah's sister is of loose character and that her husband Veeriah has left her and that she is living with her brother.

P Thammadi channiah who is aged 25 years has deposed that for 5 years past, he has been doing Puja, that before him, as far as he could remember, his father was the Pammadi; that he has heard it said that his father was Pujari for 30 years, that before his father Subbiah (since deceased)

NOTE— Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000 – 12 8 10

Serial No.

was performing Puja and that Subbiah's father and his grand-father are brothers-

Mr. Ramanathan while submitting his memo, was of opinion that nothing was proved against chamiah and there were no reasons for his removal from office and therefore the Amildar's order which was based on the Patel's action will have to be superseded-

On 14th July 1910, the Dy. Commr. ordered that chamiah should be restored, that the action of the Patel and others was high-handed and that on no account the Patel and the villagers should take the responsibility of appointing or removing the Pujaris- He further ordered that as chamiah appears sickly, he should be asked to produce a medical certificate and that if he is reported to be suffering from any contagious disease, steps should be taken to appoint a suitable substitute

Thereupon Sarvegar Ranjappa and a no. of other villagers petd. the Dy. Commr. complaining that the Asstt. Commrs. enquiry was perfunctory and superficial and stating that the temples in question

GPB—50 000—12 8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 19 11

Serial No.

were constructed, endowed and improved by Nanjappa's family and Nanjappa had the right of appointing Pujaries and praying that the Dy Commrs. order may be reviewed and cancelled after granting sufficient opportunity to adduce their evidence.

Y1 The Dy. Commr's order was directed to be held in abeyance and the Huildar was directed to submit his remarks if any, on the points urged in the Review-petition.

X1 The Huildar has held an enquiry and has submitted his report No 753 together with a Kanarese memo (M1) Dy 19th March 1911.

(Z1) The main points urged in the review-petition are :—

1) That Channiah is a leper and has a Sudra woman in his keeping, and is not a hereditary Pujari;

2) That the temples were built by Nanjappa's ancestors and the Inam lands were granted at their request.

3) That Nanjappa has the right of appointing or dismissing Pujaries (~~urged for the first time~~)

4) That Govt have no control over these matters.

The Huildar reports that a medical certificate is necessary as to the fitness

NOTE— Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 19 11

Serial No.

of the Jammadi to be a Pujari; that there was a complaint to the Police that the Jammadi and one Puttamadamma committed house-trespass (with a view to
Pldg 29 | commit adultery) but it ended in a "B" report as being the outcome of ill-feeling, and that the party favoring the Jammadi said that the previous Pujari Subbiah was the Jammadi's cousin while the party against him contradict this allegation. As regards the 2nd and 3rd points, the Amildar reports that there is no documentary evidence in their support.

As for the 4th, the Amildar says that as Mahalingeswara Temple has an Inam land and as the other temple is built on a Sircar Tope, for the benefit of the public, both are subject to the Control of Govt. The Amildar adds that the Village is divided into parties.

The Dy. Commr has for the above reasons ordered that the management of the Temples cannot be said to belong to Sarvegar Nanjappa and his order of 14th July 1910 has been confirmed in his
4, 1 | subsequent Hukum no. 30 Dy 19th July 1911.
7/1 x. | Against this order, Nanjappa has appealed

NOTE— Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 19 11

Serial No.

to Govt. He repeats that the temples were constructed by his ancestors, that he is the hereditary manager thereof and that the respdt channiah who is a leper is unfit to be a Pujari and has no right to it and cannot appoint any Gumastha.

The civil Surgeon, Mysore 25th having
5, stated that channiah was suffering from Leprosy and was unfit to be a Pujari, the Amildar has been directed to have the Puja done by channiah's Gumastha. On 11th August 1911, channiah
R, has deposed that the Puja work might be taken from his father-in-law Jammadi Mallappa who has been for 30 years a Jammadi in Doddapura,
Q, and the latter has agreed to work for channiah.

Submitted for orders.

AC 1329
25/10/1911.

The respdt Channiah being a leper is under the Hindu Law disqualified from inheritance. If he has children and his wife is healthy hereditary it may be ordered that a guardian on behalf of his children is necessary. Thereupon

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—'12-S 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 1911

Serial No.

there does not appear to be any necessity for a grant ex. abundanti cautela. The party accepted by the majority of the villagers the appellant may be appointed.

The appellant has not established that he has a right to manage the Temple & appoint Pujaris.

All in favour say Aye

W.W.14

1 Nov 1911

Mr. D.V. appears for appt.

Mr. Varadachar for respt. The latter wants an adjt as he has not been given full instructions.

The case will be adjd.

Notice will be given again (to the advs) - H

Notice issued for the 29th June 12

29 Jan 1912 Appt heard.

Mr. Varadachar heard.

Order

There is no satisfactory proof

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—35000—27.4.11

Serial No.

that Chamaiya has a hereditary right to the Office, through the fact that his father & he both acted as Pujaris does render the allegation probable. But as he has (accg to Medical observation) leprosy or (according to his own admission) venereal disease, he has no right to continue in office. The removal was in itself not wrong, though the respondent had no authority to remove him.

The Dy Cr may appoint any fit person to the post, and he may in his discretion accept any candidate put forward by either party, if he finds them the most eligible.

29/1/12

Submitted with a Dft order

30.1.12

31/1/1912

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 113 of 1911.

(12)

Serial No.	
5.	To the Deputy Commr, Mysore District No. 1813 Dt 5th February 1912 Directs that he may appoint any fit person to the post and he may in his discretion accept any Candidate put forward by either party if he finds him the most eligible. Forwards Copy of Serial No. 4 of appellant Vany Appu. No 1814 Dt 5th February 1912 Forwards Copy of Sl: 5 to Mr Varadachar for Respt Chamaiya No. 1815 Dt 5th Feb 1912

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

297

Murari

1

ಕಾಲಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಾಗಿರುವ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

1. ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಖಾತರಿ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಪಡಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು.

2. ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕು.

3. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

4. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

5. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

6. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

7. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

8. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

9. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

10. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

11. ಪರವಾನಿಗೆದಾರರು ಈ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

2565

G.R.S. 29A]

190 .

From

2583.40

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The Dy Commr,

Dated Mysore Dist

Despatched 1 — 9 — 11

Received

General No. 5482

No. 113 —11—

Enclosure No. 3

Has the honor to forward herewith for report with records, petition regd no 1297 Dy 24th August 1911 from Servegaru Ranjappa of Ragibommanahalli in the Malvalli Taluk appealing against the Dy Commrs. order refusing to recognise the petrs. right to manage the affairs of Mahadeshwara and

9 Sept 1911

Mahalingeswara Temples at
the (4) place &c. and to request
that pending disposal
of the appeal by Govt, the execution
of the Dy Commrs'
order be stayed
by allowing the applts'
nominee Veeriah to
continue as Pujari.

By order,
28/8/11
for Dy. Secretary
28/8/11

b)

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕುರಿತು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು
ತಿಳಿಸಲು ಕೋರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪತ್ರ ಸ್ವೀಕೃತವಾದ
ಒಂದು ವಾರದೊಳಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ
ತಿಳಿಸಲು ಮತ್ತು ಕೋರಿಕೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದೆ.

By order,

28/8/14

For the Secretary

28/8/14

VI 1911-1912

190

From

M. Kanakaraja Rao ..... Esq., B.A.
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

C.S. Balasundaram Iyer ..... Esq., B.A
Secy. to Govt. of Mysore,
Gen. & Rev. Depts.

Dated

Despatched 21st Sept 1911 Inwards Branch

Received

General No. 115

No.

Enclosure No. 1 & 1 file

Submits report on the appeal petition of Sevvegar ranga. pp of Ragi Boma. manahally in the Malavalli Taluk

Continue note.

A. Venkata Rao
25-9-11

if this is a case like
head copies not
to parties for this
Next if in the
file with a clear note
and be put a week before
date of hearing
26/9/1911

DIARY No 495

10/11/12
Mysore
FILE NO. 113-11
SERIAL NO. 4

GBPM—21 ; 1910—1,000

No. 115.
Enc. No. 17 file

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore Camp. 21st Septr ....1911.

FROM
M. Kantaraj Urs .....Esq., B.A.
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, MYSORE DISTRICT.

To
C.S. Balasundaram Iyer .....Esq., B.A
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Inam Branch

SIR,

Adverting to your docket No:542 dated 7-9-11 forwarding Mzg F 113-11 for report petition (herewith returned) from Sevegar Manjaiah of Ragi Bommanhally in the Malavally Taluk appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order for fuller enquiry, the petitioners right to manage the affairs of Mahadeveswara and Mahalingeswara temples at the place &, I have the honour to submit herewith the records connected with the petition received with report No: 38/135 dated 7-9-11, and to state as follows:-

2 Channiah, Poojari of Mahadeveswara and Mahalingeswara temples at Ragibommanahally in the Malavally Taluk, in his petition dated 30.3.1910, stated that he had been deprived of his duties as Poojari by Patel Madappa and others of the village; that the Amildar of the Malavally Taluk to whom the petitions were referred for enquiry was prejudiced and that therefore the case should be transferred to some other court for enquiry.

The case was therefore referred to Mr Ramanatha Aiyar, Assistant Commissioner for enquiry and report. Notices were issued to the parties and on enquiry, Mr Ramanatha submitted his report dated 7.9.1911 (filed the records) and was of opinion that nothing was proved against Channiah and there were no valid reasons for his removal from office and that therefore the Amildar's order which was mainly the patels action will have to be superseded.

4 I therefore ordered on 1.7.10 that Channaiya should be restored (9)
and that the action of the Patel and others in the high-handed and
that in future irregularities if any, should be reported to the
Amildar and on no account the Patel and the Villagers should
take the responsibility of expelling or disobeying such Pujaries.
It was further ordered that as Channaiya appeared sickly he should
be asked to produce a Medical Certificate and if found to be suffering
to be suffering from contagious disease steps should be taken to
appoint a suitable pujari.

5 Against this order Servegar Manjappa and others in their petition
dated 6-7-1910 prayed for a review and cancellation of the above
order after granting sufficient opportunity to adduce their
oral and documentary evidence.

6 Pending further orders from this office this office order dated 7.7.10
was ordered to be held in abeyance and while submitting the records
the Amildar was directed to submit his remarks if any, on the
points urged in the review Petition so far as could be gathered from
the official records. The Amildar thereupon held an enquiry and
submitted his report. As the records of the further enquiry showed
that no further proofs than those adduced during the enquiry held
by Mr Ramanathan were forth-coming and as the petitioners failed
to produce documentary evidence in support of their allegations
it was ordered that the management of the temple should be said
to belong to Servegar Manjappa's family.
It was futher ordered that the Malalingeswara Swamy temple was a
Muzrai Institution since it enjoyed an Inamdar and that though
the Medderwara temple did not enjoy any Inam grant yet the
place where the temple is built is a Sircar Tope and as such it
belonged to the villagers and that Servegar Manjappa had no exclu-
sive right over it.

7 For the foregoing reasons the order of 14.7.10 was confirmed in the
office order No:50 dated 18.7.11.

8 The present appeal to Government is against this order.

9 The Civil Surgeon having stated that Channaiah was suffering from
Lepros, the Amildar was

directed to have the puja done by Chenniah's Gumasta.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

S Rhodes

for Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

13/1

Dft as per a Desp 11

G.R.S. 28.]

File No 113-11

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to 495

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

, the 19

Date of issue

Signed by

READ—

Petition regd no D 297 Dy 24th August 1911 from one Servegar Nanjappa of Ragibommanahalli, Malvalli Sq, appealing against the Mysore

ORDER THEREON.—NIL.

Dy. Comm's order directing that Channaiya be restored as Pujari of Thar Mahadeswara and Mahalingeswara temples at the place.

Letter no 115 Dy 21st Septr 1911 from the Dy

over

SUBJECT.

GPB—10,000—19-4-10

copied 2/12

Tahsildar, Mysore District,
reporting with records relating
to the appeal

Order thereon:- No. 1813
dated 113-11

Aplt Nanjappa and
Mr. Varadachar for respt.
Bhaunaiya were heard before
Govt on the 29th Jany 1912

2) There is no satisfactory
proof that Bhaunaiya has
hereditary right to the
office, though the fact that
father and he both
do pujaris goes to
render the allegation probable
but as he has (according
to medical observation)
leprosy or (according to
his own admission) Venereal
disease, he has no right
to continue in office
removal was ~~xxx~~ in
not wrong, though the
no authority
law

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

The Dy. Commr may appoint any fit person to the post, and he may in his discretion accept any candidate put by either party, if he finds him the most eligible.

Cro. order) 31.1.1912

For Secretary.

To

31/1/12

The Dy. Commr, Mysore Dist

rctng. the records.

No 1814 Dt 5/2/12
Mus 113-11-5

Copy to Apl. Nanjappa.

No 1815 Dt 5/2/12.
Mus 113-11-5

Copy to Mr. Varadachar for respt. Channaya.

GPB—10,000—22-2-11